A U M

Some devotees give sacrifice to the Gods, while others, lighting the subtler fire of the Supreme Spirit, offer up themselves. —*Bhagavad-Gita*

THEOSOPHY

Vol. XXXV March, 1947 No. 5

"THE SUBTLER FIRE"

YEAR after year, in the cycle of the Vernal Equinox, theosophists speak of William Q. Judge, whose death in 1896 occurred on March 21st. Whether by chance or by natural law, the day of the Vernal Equinox forms a fitting capstone for the arch of Mr. Judge's life. A seasonal moment of balance in the length of day and night, the solar instant of the beginning of Spring—these accord well with one whose equal-mindedness outlasted many bleak winters of hardship, and withstood as many icy blasts of human cruelty. The darkness of the present hour often held black despair and doubt for lesser seers, but not for Judge. *He* knew that the real world is a silent one to our ears, and where the "living germ" grows is darkness to our eyes. He tended a subtler fire than has yet been lighted by many men, but he had faith that latent in each one waits or stirs the fire, the germ, and the real world. In his vision was always the oncoming Spring, when human brotherhood would flower on the Earth.

Theosophists speak of William Q. Judge not because of what he was, but because he *is*. The incidents of his career, the vicissitudes of the original Theosophical Society, the friends and enemies who opened or closed their hearts and minds to him—these are the historical circumstances of a life, and belong to the past. If his existence were contained in these, it, too, would be past and gone—"interesting," and instructive to some, perhaps, but not an imperishable Fact, nor a focus for philosophy. The Fact *is*, however, and it is the fact of Mr. Judge as a conscious servant of Humanity. In the theosophic philosophy, such an one is sometimes called a practical occultist, one who demonstrates *knowledgeable* Brotherhood.

The term Occultism is variously defined, but never explained, except by those who do not understand it. Occultism is Magic, but its magicians call it a science. It is a science, but not like any the world knows, for it is a science of man and man's Self. It is an art,

a skill and a practice, but these are only its peripheral expressions. It is neither philosophy nor metaphysics, when these are conceived as processes of the mind: Occultism is heart doctrine. The heart of the ordinary man is magnetized by personal desires and passions; where he feels most vividly alive is in a field below the mind, inferior to thought. The heart of the occultist knows no longer the turbulence, the vulnerability, the uncertainty of human emotions, no longer avoids the cool honesty of thought and conscience. The heart of the occultist beats not within, but above, the personal man; it hearkens to the dictates of the soul instead of to the confused voices of the senses; it exists beyond the mind, as mind exists above the brain.

The occultist's heart, could it be known, would hardly seem a "heart" at all, to those whose loves and interests are rooted in personal attachments, partisan causes. Those who rely on passion to energize their enthusiasm, can scarcely comprehend the force of *dispassion*. What kind of being is it, then, who unites sympathy of heart with sympathy of mind—who not only feels the sufferings and wrongs of others, but knows, and serves, their needs as well? Still deeper than that equilibrium of mind achieved, as we suspect, by a few philosophers, is the unshakable serenity of him who is master of his soul, knower of the Self. That is the "heart" of the occultist; in him, passion has given way before compassion—which has become in truth the one energy, the single enthusiasm of the being.

The occultist is a fact to be constantly reckoned with simply because he is a focus for philosophic study. Unless he is philosophically understood, he will not be *perceived at all,* let alone understood. We hear it said that the occultist is almost always misjudged. This is a figure of speech, for we are well aware that what is known does not need to be judged, and what is unknown cannot be judged. The occultist, it would be more accurate to say, is almost always unknown. He does not secrete himself, but he is secret; he does not hide: he is within. Mr. Judge, writing to a friend, invokes the *attitude* of an occultist in these words:

> Do not let us get mentally involved in this or any other matter, but stand aside—spectators, though doing with power all that comes to us to do and ready to do nothing if that be needed. . . . You are quite happy and serene, ready for all and indifferent to each, at rest in the silent place of your own abode. But, like all of us, you are not known to every man, for the soul alone knows the soul. That is why there is little need to hide in Kali Yuga! You may tell all, and they are not one jot the wiser.

What is the philosophic significance of the occultist? What is his immortality and what his influence? We must fathom the mysteries of Life, Law and Evolution before we can answer fully. But this is no reason to put off the task, since from the outset not the smallest, briefest glow of understanding will fail to light and warm our heart, our way and our life. We are not engaged in abstract theorizing on a remote human goal. We must begin to investigate the occult where it is closest to us—in ourselves. The knowledge we acquire must be a near and ready help to us where we need it most urgently—in our own lives, for our greatest difficulties, our most immediate concerns. Otherwise, it is not practical, nor can it be occultism.

The powers of an occultist are neither miraculous nor unique, and they remain for the most part unnoticed, especially since they are not apt to be spectacularly displayed, in the manner of a psychic skill. The occultist is identified not by this or that "power," but by the fact that he has—in any situation and for whatever human emergency or cyclic opportunity—the *needed power*. Thus is William Q. Judge to be identified. His bearing, through the most difficult crises, was marked by dispassion, a quality never achieved except by one who sees the future as it will be—*if work for the future* goes on without interruption. Mr. Judge was an occultist because he was intensely practical. Not his most casual days or ways were empty of the vision of ages. He *is* an occultist, because his conduct and counsel remain twin powers in the theosophical movement, a dual education in the principles of spiritual action.

Forming the Nucleus

We are not working merely that people may call themselves *Theosophists,* but that the doctrines we cherish may affect and leaven the whole mind of this century. This alone can be accomplished by a small earnest band of workers, who work for no human reward, no earthly recognition, but who, supported and sustained by a belief in that Universal Brotherhood of which our Masters are a part, work steadily, faithfully, in understanding and putting forth for consideration the doctrines of life and duty that have come down to us from immemorial time. Falter not so long as a few devoted ones will work to keep the nucleus existing. You were not directed to found and realise a Universal Brotherhood, but to form the nucleus for one; for it is only when the nucleus is formed that the accumulations can begin that will end in future years, however far, in the formation of that body which we have in view. —H.P.B.

OCCULTISM: WHAT IS IT?

NOT only in the Theosophical Society, but out of it, are tyros in Occultism. They are dabblers in a fine art, a mighty science, an almost impenetrable mystery. The motives that bring them to the study are as various as the number of individuals engaged in it, and as hidden from even themselves as is the center of the earth from the eye of science. Yet the *motive* is more important than any other factor.

These dilettanti in this science have always been abroad. No age or country has been without them, and they have left after them many books—of no particular value. Those of to-day are making them now, for the irresistible impulse of vanity drives them to collate the more or less unsound hypotheses of their predecessors, which, seasoned with a proper dash of mystery, are put forth to the crowd of those who would fain acquire wisdom at the cost-price of a book. Meanwhile the world of real occultists smiles silently, and goes on with the laborious process of sifting out the living germs from the masses of men. For occultists must be found and fostered and prepared for coming ages when power will be needed and pretension will go for nothing.

But the persons now writing about occultism and competent to do any more than repeat unproved formulae and assertions left over from mediaeval days, are few in number. It is very easy to construct a book full of so-called occultism taken from French or German books, and then to every now and then stop the reader short by telling him that it is not wise to reveal any more. The writings of Christian in France give much detail about initiations into occultism, but he honestly goes no further than to tell what he has gained from Greek and Latin fragments. Others, however, have followed him, repeated his words without credit, and as usual halted at the explanation.

There are, again, others who, while asserting that there is magic science called occultism, merely advise the student to cultivate purity and spiritual aspirations, leaving it to be assumed that powers and knowledge will follow. Between these two, Theosophists of the self-seeking or the unselfish type are completely puzzled. Those who are selfish may learn by bitter disappointment and sad experience; but the unselfish and the earnest need encouragement on the one hand and warning on the other. As an Adept wrote years ago to London

---

NOTE.—This article by Mr. Judge was first published in *The Path*, May, 1890. —Eds. THEOSOPHY.

Theosophists: "He who does not feel equal to the work need not undertake a task too heavy for him." This is applicable to all, for every one should be informed of the nature and heaviness of the task. Speaking of this tremendous thing—Occultism—Krishna in the *Bhagavad-Gita* says: "During a considerable period of time this doctrine has been lost in the world. . . . This mystery is very important." We do not think that the doctrine has yet been restored to the world, albeit that it is in the keeping of living men—the Adepts. And in warning those who strive after occultism with a selfish motive he declares: "Confused by many worldly thoughts, surrounded by the meshes of bewilderment, devoted to the enjoyment of their desires, they descend to foul Naraka . . . and hence they proceed to the lowest plane of being."

In what, then, does the heaviness of the Occultist's task consist? In the immensity of its sweep as well as the infinitude of its detail. Mere sweet and delightful longing after God will not of itself accomplish it, nor is progress found in *aspiring* to self-knowledge, even when as a result of that is found partial illumination. These are excellent; but we are talking of a problem whose implacable front yields to nothing but *force,* and that force must be directed by *knowledge.*

The field is not emotional, for the play of the emotions destroys the equilibrium essential to the art. Work done calling for reward avails not unless it has produced knowledge.

A few examples will show that in Occult Science there is a vastness and also a multiplicity of division not suspected by theosophical Occultists in embryo.

The element of which fire is a visible effect is full of centres of force. Each one is ruled by its own law. The aggregate of centres and the laws governing them which produce certain physical results are classed by science as laws in physics, and are absolutely ignored by the book-making Occultist because he has no knowledge of them. No dreamer or even a philanthropist will ever as such know those laws. And so on with all the other elements.

The Masters of Occultism state that a law of "transmutation among forces" prevails forever. It will baffle any one who has not the power to calculate the value of even the smallest tremble of a vibration, not only in itself but instantly upon its collision with another, whether that other be similar to it or different. Modern science admits the existence of this law as the correlation of forces. It is felt in the moral sphere of our being as well as in the physical

world, and causes remarkable changes in a man's character and circumstances quite beyond us at present and altogether unknown to science and metaphysics.

It is said that each person has a distinct mathematical value expressed by one number. This is a compound or resultant of numberless smaller values. When it is known, extraordinary effects may be produced not only in the mind of the person but also in his feelings, and this number may be discovered by certain calculations more recondite than those of our higher mathematics. By its use the person may be made angry without cause, and even insane or full of happiness, just as the operator desires.

There is a world of beings known to the Indians as that of the Devas, whose inhabitants can produce illusions of a character the description of which would throw our wildest romances into the shade. They may last five minutes and seem as a thousand years, or they may extend over ten thousand actual years.

Into this world the purest theosophist, the most spiritual man or woman, may go without consent, unless the knowledge and power are possessed which prevent it.

On the threshold of all these laws and states of being linger forces and beings of an awful and determined character. No one can avoid them, as they are on the road that leads to knowledge, and they are every now and then awakened or perceived by those who, while completely ignorant on these subjects, still persist in dabbling with charms and necromantic practises.

It is wiser for theosophists to study the doctrine of brotherhood and its application, to purify their motives and actions, so that after patient work for many lives, if necessary, in the great cause of humanity, they may at last reach that point where all knowledge and all power will be theirs by right. —EUSEBIO URBAN

THE SOUL'S DEMAND

If there is uncharitableness, if there is disloyalty, if there are harshness and unbrotherliness in the race, they exist also in us if only in germ. Those germs require only the proper personal conditions to make them sprout. Our duty therefore is to continually encourage in ourselves the active feelings that are the opposites of those. Those of us who think knowledge can be acquired without pursuing the path of love mistake. The soul is aware of what it requires. It demands altruism, and so long as that is absent, so long will mere intellectual study lead to nothing. —W.Q.J.

SCIENCE AND THE SECRET DOCTRINE

Cycle of Responsibility

A FUNDAMENTAL revision in scientific attitudes, long in preparation, far-reaching in effect, is gradually becoming evident in scientific literature. Reasons for this change are various, some of them recondite, growing out of the long-term cycle of human evolution; others arising more or less obviously from the progress of science itself and the stimulus of contemporary events.

Theosophically, the humanization of science is to be explained by the progressive incarnation of the Manasic principle during this cycle. The deepening of the mental life of the race involves an increase in the sense of reality men have for the mind, the feeling that there lies the truly human existence. This attitude tends to make the old scientific explanations of human nature—theories based on nineteenth-century physics and biology—seem vaguely mechanical and needlessly animalistic. While these theories of the past may linger on in textbooks for a time, the scientific heart is not in them.

Correlated with the subtle changes induced by the mind-principle itself are the multiple influences of scientific progress. The working of a machine is no longer a useful analogy for understanding the great laws elaborated by contemporary physics. Matter has become little more than stresses and strains in the dynamic fabric of "space"; it is an "arrangement," a habit, a pattern of energy. Matter breaks down, not into little bits of matter called "atoms," but into something else—call it vibration. Reality, for the physicist, is a matter of equations. If you ask a modern scientist what is really "real," he will put a lot of symbols on a blackboard and try to explain them. Matter, in short, is an abstraction, and physical reality has dissolved into complex mathematical nebulae.

Another aspect of scientific development has led to revaluation of most of the particulars of nineteenth-century evolutionary theory. While the central dogma of the animal origin of man remains unchallenged, research has steadily undermined the plausibility of the evidence originally proposed in its support. Genetics, for example, the branch of Biology concerned with heredity, has provided little information concerning the actual processes of evolution. Evolution is still an undoubted fact, but its method escapes modern biology. Present research centers upon the nature of mutations, those sudden changes in the germ cell held responsible for the origination of new species. Even cosmic rays have been seriously invoked as possibly a cause of mutations in the line of hereditary

descent, but no scientific certainty enlightens any of the current theories to explain them. Last year's Nobel Prizeman in medicine and physiology, Dr. H. J. Muller, authority on artificially induced gene mutations, has gloomily stated that most of the changes in the genetic constitution that he has been able to observe are for the worse—which can hardly account for evolutionary progress!

A second phase of biological investigation focusses on the problem of form. The combined efforts of a number of researchers have produced the conclusion that form is electro-dynamic—a far cry from mechanistic speculations of the past. Study of life phenomena is now a department of electrical engineering. But the origin of form itself remains a mystery.

The intensive study of such problems as these has withdrawn the energy, and therefore the conviction, of scientists from attempts at "proof" of popular Darwinism. Of greater interest to present-day scientific thinkers is the now familiar idea of the "impact" of science on modern society—the central theme of many essays during recent years. A resolution of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, passed in January, 1938, adopted as an objective of the Association "an examination of the profound effects of science on society," and few scientific writers have needed any encouragement to explore the question. It was then stated that the American scientists "accepted the challenge to science for moral leadership in a disordered and puzzled world." Today, nine years later, the need for moral leadership is as great, and the disorder and puzzlement have been increased manyfold by the scientific "contribution" of the atomic bomb.

While scientists discuss the problem of future control of weapons involving nuclear fission, ominous reports of even more destructive devices appear in the newspapers from week to week. The nations of the world are engaged in a new war of nerves, in which the threat of bacterial poisoning plays an almost conventional role, and small-minded statesmen speak menacingly of the annihilating power which they believe scientific discovery capable of adding to national armaments. As a result, many scientists have slammed the door on their ivory towers of "pure research" and thrown away the key. For the first time in modern history, the issue between power and social responsibility has been effectively joined and summarily laid on the work-tables of men who, until the advent of the second world war, asked only to be left alone to devote themselves to "the pursuit of truth." Now a truth that science has neglected for generations—the principle of moral responsibility—has sought them out.

In the United States, a few physicists have dared to advocate scientific boycott of military establishments. In *Science* for Dec. 28, 1945, Dr. Gordon F. Hull, Dartmouth physicist, proposed the formation of a World Association of Physicists whose members would subscribe to certain principles of cooperation with other scientists, "irrespective of nationality," and would pledge themselves "not to give advice concerning, or assist in making, atomic bombs." Similar proposals have been voiced in England, the conservative consensus, however, as stated by Julian Huxley, being simply that the scientist "has a special duty of trying to organize public opinion in the direction of controlling his discoveries."

John O'Neill, science editor of the New York *Herald Tribune,* has presented the minority viewpoint which assigns extreme individual responsibility to scientists. Drawing upon history, he shows that the subservience of inventive genius to political purposes may have greatly delayed the progress of civilization. He calls upon scientists to emancipate themselves from enslavement to the modern military state. To illustrate his thesis, he cites the invention by Leonardo da Vinci of a steam gun containing "all the elements of the reciprocating steam engine." Leonardo's great talents were exploited by the warring Dukes of the Italian Renaissance, who required the production of machines for war, of which his "steam gun" was an example. "If," writes O'Neill, "the genius that produced this invention had been directed toward peaceful pursuits the world might have had the steam engine about 1500 instead of having to wait for 275 years more for Newcomen and Watt to produce it." He continues:

> The guns and other contrivances which da Vinci produced were extremely useful to the Lombardian dukes and they would have no trouble in justifying their production. However, if they had not got their guns, the world might have got the steam engine and civilization would have been advanced by three centuries. Who today can recall what the causes were for which the dukes found it necessary to fight?
>
> A similar situation faces the world today in connection with the atomic bomb. . . . There are those among the scientists who, willingly or against their better judgment, are acting as stalking horses to lead lesser lights and the great body of scientists into this enslaved state. Like the dukes of the sixteenth century, they and the government sponsors can advance plausible justifications for their action.
>
> To those who can see the larger scroll of history it is very apparent that those who, in their hysteria, would enslave and sterilize science, are functioning on a cycle of activity with just as short a wave length as was the cycle of the Nazis and Japanese imperialists and with

identical characteristics—but the situation always seems excusable on the home grounds. (*Herald Tribune,* Dec. 23, 1945.)

Mr. O'Neill represents a view subscribed to by more scientists than may be suspected. Discussing the "deep dismay" felt by those who were leaders in the development of the atomic bomb, Katherine Chamberlain, professor of physics at Wayne University, gives clear definition to their dilemma:

> It has been my privilege to see several of the people who have contributed to the development of our knowledge of radioactivity at sufficiently close range to be quite certain that a group less inclined to present the world with this means of destruction would be difficult to imagine. To the very great, physics is still natural philosophy, and the search for truth for its own sake is very common. Heretofore, it has always been the highest compliment that could be paid a scientist that he sought the truth without fear or favor. But, now, a moral dilemma of appalling proportions has been injected into the research. Is love of truth to be paramount, or love of mankind? Is the immediate advantage of one's country to be the primary consideration or the welfare of the world? Will man be equal to this great responsibility that he must now assume? The idea is not new that he sows the seeds of his own destruction when he seeks to usurp power that transcends his wisdom. (*Science,* Feb. 8, 1946.)

Prof. Chamberlain says that the directors and senior research staffs of laboratories capable of manufacturing atomic bombs "probably do not include more than one hundred persons in the entire world." If these leaders—most of whom know one another—"were to publish an agreement that no further investigations involving release of atomic energy for military purposes would be carried on in the laboratories under their jurisdiction, the case against the atomic bomb would have the direct sanction of very exalted authority." Thus far, she writes, "Scientists have always lost control over their inventions and discoveries as soon as the creative phase was completed. Can't we act while there is still time?"

In *Science* for Sept. 13, 1946, Dr. Hull returns to his thesis of scientific non-cooperation with war-making governments:

> The scientists of this Nation are not likely to make war on this or any other nation. We are not combative or competitive. We should unite with the scientists of all other nations to outlaw war. No iron curtain should be allowed to enclose and segregate the scientists of any nation.

The problem, however, is not as simple as Dr. Hull implies. In a subsequent number of *Science* (Oct. 4), another physics teacher replies:

> It goes without saying that neither will the physicians of this Nation [make war], nor the teachers, nor, for that matter, the plumbers or the bartenders. Nevertheless, all of these were embroiled in the recent carnage, and the physicists were in the thick of the fight. Significantly enough, Dr. Hull's paper is preceded by a description of a gigantic naval research institution in which some 2,000 civilians, most of them scientists, will be sharpening the modern swords of war. When the bombs fall, scientists too, as well as their children, will die. As citizens, they cannot afford to assume a holier-than-thou attitude.

The moral dilemma of the scientists grows acute when it is realized that in the past research has been largely dependent upon industrial patronage—as pointed out by J. D. Bernal in the *Scientific Monthly,* December ,1945—while its future seems mortgaged to the all-powerful State. Ernest W. Goodpasture, winner of the 1946 award of the Passano Foundation for medical research, writes of the need of science to be independent of political masters:

> The great threat of our age to human welfare, as I see it, is that societies led or driven by industrialism are gathering the individual into their fold as a service unit. The individual as a member of society thus must do a society's bidding, regardless of the particular pattern that social organization might temporarily represent. To the true scientist, the present frame of social organization is not the end of all wisdom but just another phenomenon to be viewed objectively in the course of his inquiries. The scientist's limits are the boundaries of the universe, and his functions cannot, without destroying him, be limited to the service of any particular social order. Industrial, social, religious and political patterns are not yet drawn to serve mankind. It is to be hoped that each governmental power will provide an oasis for students who are individual elements of mankind first and servants of society last. Otherwise intellectual growth will wither and die. (*Science,* Nov. 22, 1946.)

The expectation that any present-day "governmental power" will exempt the scientist from service to the State during a national crisis —any more than Leonardo was relieved of military employments during his sixteen-year term of service for the Duke of Milan—betrays the curious naïveté of specialists whose personal experience with "military necessity" has been extremely brief. But the question of the scientist's moral obligations to mankind has been raised. Discussion of it will contnue, and as there is no "easy answer," the implications of the problem are bound to be increasingly disclosed.

On this general subject, Dr. Gene Weltfish, co-author with Ruth Benedict of the pamphlet, *Races of Mankind,* has declared that "the disinterestedness of the scientist is largely mythical—that it amounts

to a lack of evaluation of purposes, and that as a consequence, the scientist can readily become the creator of havoc and destruction." (*Scientific Monthly,* September, 1945.) She adds:

> "I further maintain that such a robot scientist is a greater menace to humanity than the robot bomb. In our reconstructed world graduating scientists should take cognizance of their responsibilities for the social consequences resulting from their use of scientific techniques."

Enough has been quoted from contemporary scientific literature to illustrate the enormous impact of the atomic bomb on scientific thinking. (Further material on this subject has appeared in THEOSOPHY XXXIV, 30, 111, 150.) The arousal of scientists to intense reflection, in some cases, to virtual desperation, is certainly desirable, but satisfaction over these various expressions ought not to blind us to the larger ironies of the situation. In the recently published "credo" of the greatest living physicist, Albert Einstein, appears the statement, " . . . force always attracts men of low morality." For a generation, Dr. Einstein has been a symbol of both human greatness and human gentleness. A man of quiet humor, to whom the highest good has ever been "the creative, sentient individual," he last year addressed to the public a telegraphed appeal for support of a nation-wide campaign to "let the people know that new type of thinking is essential if mankind is to survive and move toward higher levels." (Los Angeles *Daily News,* May 27, 1946.) This man, whose career of revolutionary physical discovery has been from the beginning associated with extreme abhorrence of war, now tells the American people:

> Our world faces a crisis as yet unperceived by those possessing power to make decisions for good or evil. The unleashed power of the atom has changed everything but our modes of thinking and we thus drift toward unparalleled catastrophe.
>
> We scientists who released this immense power have overwhelming responsibility in this world life-and-death struggle to harness the atom for benefit of mankind and not for humanity's destruction.

Yet it was the peaceful and harmless Dr. Einstein who, late in 1939, wrote to the President of the United States, recommending that this nation begin research on a bomb involving controlled chain reaction of atomic fission. As reported in *Time* for July 1, 1946, Dr. Einstein enclosed to the President a detailed report by Dr. Leo Szilard, who told how and why the bomb might be made. But it was Dr. Einstein's famous equation ($E=mc^2$) which made the atomic bomb theoretically possible. The result, in *Time's* clipped phrases: "The Manhattan Project, the bomb, the 125,000 dead of Hiroshima

and Nagasaki, and the biggest boost humanity has yet been given toward terminating its brief history of misery and grandeur."

If ever a great man was overtaken by a tragedy, not peculiarly his, but belonging to the entire human race—of our time and karmic circumstances—it is Albert Einstein. "There is," he is constrained to say, "no foreseeable defense against atomic bombs." He must confess, like Duryodhana, that our forces are "not sufficient." His manifest love of mankind, his purity of purpose, his uncompromising and elevated stoic philosophy, his inestimable contributions to scientific knowledge—all these can balance but little the grim despair of one who envisons a world contorted by the shudders of atomic cataclysm.

Consistent with current medical theory, it seems, Nature is administering the shock treatment for a humanity running amok with natural forces rifled from her secret sanctuaries. The therapy, as in the modern mental hospitals, produces convulsions in the patient —in this case a sudden evocation of the moral sense of sensitive men, of scientists and educators—and the result remains to be seen. Whether the treatment will be sufficient to avoid a repetition of the catastrophes of Hiroshima and Nagasaki is an open question; sometimes, the "shocks" have no lasting effect; but it is certain that the direction of scientific inquiry will change as a consequence of the new emphasis on human responsibility among scientific workers. Before a quarter of a century more, many new theories of man and his nature will find their way into scientific literature, flowing from this profound change in motivation. And with these new approaches, the sparks of intuition, already manifest in many quarters, may burst into a bright flame of truth.

"Age of Inquiry"

The theosophist sees all around him the evidence that the race mind is changing by enlargement, that the old days of dogmatism are gone and the "age of inquiry" has come, that the inquiries will grow louder year by year and the answers be required to satisfy the mind as it grows more and more, until at last, all dogmatism being ended, the race will be ready to face all problems, each man for himself, all working for the good of the whole, and that the end will be the perfecting of those who struggle to overcome the brute.

—W.Q.J.

"THE FIRST FEELING"

PERHAPS one of the greatest advantages held by students of the Wisdom Religion is the extended vision they are given of the evolution of the Human Race. Embracing ages upon ages of cyclic growth and unfoldment, Theosophy begins with the birth of Humanity on this globe, traces its development through stages of infancy and childhood, when all was peaceful and fair, and indicates the causes by which the present darkness came to be.

This widened vision of evolution shows that human nature has not always been in a degraded state, raises one's mind and heart out of the slough of despond, and establishes hope for the future. The feeling of solidarity or brotherhood is proved to be not only possible but *natural* to man, because it was the first emotion of the human heart, the expression of a fact in nature—the fundamental identity of all souls with the Universal Over-Soul. The *Secret Doctrine* recounts:

> When moved by the law of Evolution, the Lords of Wisdom infused into [the human form] the spark of consciousness, the first feeling it awoke to life and activity was a sense of solidarity, of oneness with his spiritual creators. As the child's first feeling is for its mother and nurse, so the first aspirations of the awakening consciousness in primitive man were for those whose element he felt within himself, and who yet were outside, and independent of him. DEVOTION arose out of that feeling, and became the first and foremost motor in his nature. . . .

Both H. P. Blavatsky and William Q. Judge pointed repeatedly to the necessity for faith in the Elder Brothers, on the part of all who would hope to succeed in their efforts toward Brotherhood. Wherever real faith is not strong, said Mr. Judge, there the work goes down. Lack of faith and devotion spelled defeat in the past, and will cause failure after failure in the future. It is not possible for brotherhood and harmony to grow out of the soil of human sin and selfishness. Every impulse toward a higher life arises in that spiritual potency which is quickened by belief in the existence of Masters. Faith in the Mahatmas as ideals and facts opens channels in the mind and heart through which spiritual help may flow.

Might it be, therefore, that failure in the past has been due to the fact that we began at the wrong end, that we attempted to create unity or agreement between our own sins and failings and those of others? Have we labored under the illusion that brotherhood could be achieved by harmonizing the elements of Kama

Manas, by blending the selfishness in our own heart with the doubts and hates in the hearts of others? Such agreement in the alchemical laboratory of man's lower nature is not possible, nor is it necessary on the road to universal brotherhood. Harmony in music does not require that every note in the scale should be the same. The violinist or harpist is not concerned with the work of the drummer sitting by his side. Each plays his own part, each studies the music which is common to all. Thus devoted and commonly inspired by the spirit of the composer, the natural outcome is a beautiful symphony of balance and harmony. If individual theosophists labor under the idea that their own particular note in the scale is the only one that needs to be sounded; if we concern ourselves too much with the work of our fellows next at hand; then we have failed to play our part in the great symphony.

A spirit of absolute brotherhood and harmony reigned among members of the early human races. But this feeling of love and respect was not effected by horizontal effort—it did not grow out of mutual and deliberate agreement between the units to act in a brotherly way. True unity is the result of something far more natural. The spirit of fraternity existing among primeval men was the result of their feeling of oneness with their spiritual creators. Just as the turning of the blossom toward the Sun permits the warming rays to draw out and fructify all its qualities, so devotion to Masters and their Cause awakens every power in the human heart. The chief purpose of the writings of H. P. Blavatsky and Wm. Q. Judge is to arouse to activity man's first emotion, his dormant sense of solidarity, his feeling of oneness with the Elder Brothers. From this, brotherhood among the units will arise as naturally as comes the morning sun.

"A Law of Divine Nature"

It is the province of mankind through its higher and more spiritual races to fill the great gap [between practical and ideal perfection] more and more with every coming cycle; for every man, as a unit, has it in his power to add his mite toward filling it. Yes; there are still men, who, notwithstanding the present chaotic condition of the moral world, and the sorry *debris* of the best human ideals, still persist in believing and teaching that the now *ideal* human perfection is no dream, but a law of divine nature; and that, had Mankind to wait even millions of years, still it must some day reach it and rebecome *a race of gods.* —H.P.B.

OUTLOOK ON ETHICS

THE endeavour to universalize thought and feeling away from racial and sectarian distinctions was a dominant objective of the Theosophical Movement at its inception. The degree of success or failure in the attainment of this aim during the years that followed is to be measured against the background of the moral confusion which is presented at the birth of the Atomic Age. Of H. P. Blavatsky herself it can be said that her nineteenth-century incarnation was not a failure, for her teachings are recorded, and her inspiration continues to encourage those who survive as a nucleus of students and brothers, true to the original programme. But the transgressions of publicists, who confused personal ambition with fidelity, contributed only to darken counsel. The activities of such "followers" inevitably impeded the impact of the universal philosophy upon the growth and development of human affairs. The world turned its back upon the Light, and walking in its own shadow, cried out that all was dark.

No longer does the Revelation of theology or the Rationalism of science suffice to show clearly the landmarks to be followed if we are to find a path through the jungle of modern civilization. The foundations of faith have been destroyed by the deluge of nihilistic thought, and by the cynicism engendered in superficial natures by the observed gulf between precept and practice. Science has lost the possibility of moral leadership because her discoveries and inventions proudly deny philanthropic intent. If moral purposes should arise, these are imposed upon scientific development by the social consciousness of mankind, haphazard though that may be in its functioning.

It is obviously needful that the application and clarification of the Secret Doctrine shall be pursued unwaveringly. It has been said that the existence of the spiritual failure and conscious or unconscious egotism of this age may be traced to the absence of the character of universality in Western conceptions of philanthropy. Too often our boasted "love of mankind" is empirical in its nature and possesses selfish preferences and affinities. For the sincere theosophist who sees what is happening, the Present will always be "a time for greatness." His opportunities of teaching (by life more than by word) will be directed to showing that a man's life is morally good in proportion as it exhibits purpose and, not only purpose, but, in the Platonic sense, a purpose going beyond himself. Unless we have some idea of man's place in nature, obviously our ethical conceptions will be ready-made and a matter of guess-work, without other valid-

ity than may be accorded to conventional thought. Contemporary thought is rarely more than a social convention adapted to a particular phase of cultural history. In manner, if not in form, it remains very much the same throughout successive stages of historical growth. The "corrupt" man of the theological Fall in Western religious thought (so closely allied to the *post*-Vedic Brahminical attitude towards other castes) has its modern counterpart in the Marxian view of man as a social phenomenon and the assumed innate superiority of a proletariat determined by economic causes. "It is not the consciousness of men that determines their existence," wrote Karl Marx, "but, on the contrary, their social existence determines their consciousness."

The irony involved in the ethical outlook characteristic of the majority of those most violently opposed to Marx's doctrine is that they have unconsciously adopted his view. Not perhaps in the economic features of the teaching, but certainly in their acceptance of the convention that man is the sport of chance, and of the view that moral principles are only useful insofar as they conduce to well-being and success in life. Some have even found that the maxims of a very different teacher, Jesus, "pay" in worldly relationships—if applied in "the right spirit," *i. e.*, realistically, and not in any Tolstoyan or Dostoevskian way! It is but a short step from this form of self-deception to the tolerance and justification of lying and brutality to the extent that they "work" in the achievement of individual or national ends. Arthur Rosenberg, philosopher-in-chief to the defunct Nazi Movement in Germany, believed and taught that the idea of Universal Love was a "blow at the soul of Nordic Europe." Marx considered that the conception of the Kingdom of Heaven was a "historical necessity," arising out of the oppression of the poor who looked for a materialistic compensation for their lot on earth, and who, alas, were ignorant of the socio-economic process of history! His view was, in the economic sphere, the collateral of "the primitive man" conception of anthropological science, and of the Western orientalists' interpretation of the Buddhist *nirvana*. His blood brother was Ernst Haeckel, with his materialistic solution of the Riddle of the Universe. The ethical consequences of these and similar teachings, professed or unconsciously accepted, are before our eyes today. "Such men" (as H. P. Blavatsky said of Haeckel, T. H. Huxley, and others), "are simply the intellectual and moral murderers of future generations" (*S. D.* II, 651).

The people look up, and are not fed. They get only the stony categories of theological and scientific superstitions, or the provender

furnished by professional moralists from their excursions to the realms of Intuitionism, Utilitarianism, and Perfectionism. We are left to guess how we may ever hope to arrive at a truthful judgment of the rightness or wrongness of particular acts, without a conception of human life as a whole. It is true that such a modern psychologist as Dr. Samuel Lowy warns us that "we have to mark, learn, and inwardly digest the fact that no plan for the improvement of life, whether private or social, can fully succeed unless regard is had for the complex nature of man." But, the complexity is referable to the intra-psychic struggle within the mind and nervous system, and we find that it is the quality of the "affect-ego," born of different mental, physical, and environment conditions, which finally decides man's ethical behaviour. (*Man and His Fellow-man,* Samuel Lowy, M.D., London, Kegan Paul, 1944.)

Moral decision is thus left to the turbulent nature of the environmentally-conditioned *kama rupa,* "where lies the line of demarcation which separates the mortal man from the immortal entity" (*Key to Theosophy*). No hope in all the world would appear to be offered by contemporary thought for man and his insatiable hunger for "the unattainable," save in blind faith, or in the consulting rooms of our modern priests of the soul—the practising psychologists. Are we to be content with the moral determinants thus vouchsafed for our consideration? Does man consist only of appetites that have to be "compensated" either by the death of a theologically conceived "God-Saviour," or by the release of inhibitions through a psychological technique with its own amoral sanctions? Are we to assume that Love and Sacrifice are only consecrated when they are offered up in devotion to a tribal deity, or measured by the "give and take" of psycho-analytical adjustments?

> Not that love which only gives, not that love which gives itself up. It is rather the love that enjoys its loving. . . . And one cannot love others if to do so entails too much risk of being disappointed. . . . (Dr. Samuel Lowy, *ibid.*)

Here is the contractual theory of human relationships in its most insidious form; Hobbes' *Leviathan* arguments working themselves out in the realm of the human *psyche* no less than in theories of government. How puerile, if not criminal, in the light of transcendental ethics of universal validity, is the "civilized" effort to achieve a precarious moral balance by the process of sublimation!

Shall not we rather hold with Emerson that "no change of circumstances can repair a defect of character," and, like him, "know who

is benevolent, by quite other means than the amount of subscription to soup societies. It is only low merits that can be enumerated"? For what does morality mean in a man's innermost life? In Books V to VII of the Republic, Plato was concerned with the waste and perversion of what he felt to be the most precious thing in human nature —the capacity for attaining truth. What is the moral law without which that capacity cannot be conserved and developed? Where shall we find the basis for its operation in the human being? The answers are to be found in that synthesis of science, religion, and philosophy, which is the Secret Doctrine of all ages.

The essential principle of an ethical outlook which takes account of the whole nature of man is described by H. P. Blavatsky in these words:

> Indeed, as the aggregate sound of nature is shown to be a single definite tone, a key-note vibrating from and through eternity; having an undeniable existence *per se* yet possessing an appreciable pitch but for "the acutely fine ear"—so the definite harmony or disharmony of man's external nature is seen by the observant to depend wholly on the character of the key-note struck for the *outer* by *inner* man. It is the spiritual EGO or SELF that serves as the fundamental base, determining the tone of the whole life of man. . . . Therefore, we say, man, in addition to the physical, has also a spiritual brain. ("Are Dreams but Idle Visions?" *The Theosophist,* January, 1882.)

Here is the secret of the cultural processes in human history, developing in accordance with Cyclic and Karmic Law. It is a proposition antithetical to much contemporary thought—such a suggestion, for instance, as that made by Dr. Ellsworth Huntington in his monumental work, *Mainsprings of Civilization* (New York, 1945), to the effect that a "psychological awakening based upon the physiological effect of storms may prove to be the missing factor that historians have sought in their attempts to explain the revival of the human spirit which ended the Middle Ages." We thus find ourselves back with the "missing link" of biological science under another name and as applied to the narrative of history!

Whilst admitting that "in a world of illusion in which the law of evolution operates," man's moral code will "at one time embody the noblest altruistic and aspirational ideals, while at the other the ruling conscience will be but the reflection of selfishness, brutality, and faithlessness," Esoteric Philosophy asserts that:

> All grows and develops and strives toward perfection (on the planes of externality); but on the ultimate plane of the spiritual essence all IS, and remains therefore immutable. It is toward this

> eternal ESSE that every thing, as every being, is gravitating, gradually, almost imperceptibly, but as surely as the Universe of stars and worlds moves towards a mysterious point known to, yet still unnamed by, astronomy and called by the Occultists—the *central Spiritual Sun.* ("The Fall of Ideals," *Lucifer,* December, 1889.)

In this view, we may say that man is essentially a morally responsible being. The Good is the supreme object of knowledge, and (as in the Platonic philosophy) the ultimate condition of morality is also the ultimate condition of understanding. As he shapes his life to universal ends of a compassionate nature, man grows in spiritual knowledge. He experiences the expansive force of Justice as the Greeks conceived of it—a comprehensive term, in its widest sense equivalent to "the whole of virtue as shown in our dealings with others" (Aristotle, Eth. Nic.). He sees, too, what Plato meant by his conception of "measure":

> The characteristically Greek way of describing morality is to say, that the moral man is the man who recognises that there is a principle. That is to the Greeks the point of contact between morality, art, science, and everything in which reason is concerned. (R. L. Nettleship, *Lectures on the Republic of Plato,* Macmillan, 1906.)

Justice, in fact, is a living principle in the human soul, which works itself out in the conduct of life. It is the moving force making for the "eternal *Esse,*" as well as "the central Spiritual Sun." For Justice (or *Karma-Dharma*) is the single pervading law of which the Universe is the manifestation, and human life is good insofar as it recognizes and acts in accordance with that law. The "laws of Nature," as constituting an undeviating mode of activity, have here their source and explanation. Indeed, when the organization of society, law, religion, science, and art, are seen to be products ultimately of the human soul, we may measure their ethical content by their more or less true expression of an inner principle of life working itself out in these cultural processes. Because of this, H. P. Blavatsky warned her readers:

> Mere physical philanthropy, apart from the infusion of new influences and ennobling conceptions of life into the minds of the masses, is worthless. The gradual assimilation by mankind of great spiritual truths will alone revolutionize the face of civilization. . . . ("Practical Occultism," *Lucifer* I, 327.)

The moral perplexities of our times will only find solution in an active comprehension of the true nature of man and his evolution within the ambit of Ethical Causation, which binds all living things in an indefectible Brotherhood.

YOUTH-COMPANIONS AT HOME

"I JUST don't think it's right, Mother," Madge declared, her irritation making her fumble as she tied on her apron. "We get the dinner. We set the table. And then we wash the dishes afterwards. Don't see why men are exempt from all the housework," she muttered rebelliously, dropping glasses into the dishpan with an abandon that sent Mother into a silent agony of anticipation. Hearing no untoward noises from the soapy depths, however, Mother took heart and turned a smiling face to her indignant daughter.

"Seems as if you're not fully appreciating the 'household life' these days," she said, allowing irony to mask her seriousness. "Are you succumbing to the idea that a kitchen or a tousled living room is a limiting environment, and that the clothesline marks the outermost horizon of the home? I must say," she went on, speaking with the lightness she could so well assume to ease a straining situation, "that I've seen a lot more menial people than menial jobs, and I've never known a 'big' person to refuse the simplest chore or be belittled by the smallness of any service."

Mother paused a moment to inspect a glass before depositing it on the shelf. "On the matter of who does how much, we can call a family conference and perhaps you would like to present the problem," she suggested, fully aware of the reaction her suggestion would meet.

"Oh, no," exclaimed Madge, too quickly. Confronted with the prospect of presenting a case, she suddenly found that the evidence was mostly on the other side. Her private chagrin at this conclusion issued in a martyr's sigh, followed by a disclaimer: "No, even if they *did* agree to it, they'd probably just feel injured and imposed upon."

Mother stifled her amusement at Madge's unconscious disclosure that *she* was Injured and Imposed Upon, but had to smile when her daughter added:

"They're probably afraid of getting into a rut—and I don't blame them, either. Ruts are one thing *I'm* going to steer clear of!"

Mother took a moment or two to digest this, then decided resignedly, another mood. She felt her way, without looking at her daughter.

"Of course, there are ruts and ruts . . . " she murmured vaguely.

Madge didn't seem disposed to comment on this, so Mother continued doggedly. "I can still remember what a shock it was to me when I first realized that it was quite possible for someone who was

always railing against other people's grooved behavior to be running remarkably close to *their* ruts in a fine deep set of his own."

Madge reddened and turned away on pretext of reaching for the plates. "Well, at least his rut isn't crowded. That's something!"

"—Or so his conceit would try to convince him," Mother retorted. "But often what we may conceive as a 'new departure' isn't really that at all. By the way, what ruts, especially, are you thinking to avoid?" she queried in apparent idleness, paying great attention at this point to the disposition of the knives and forks.

"Any ruts." Madge shrugged her shoulders. "I don't think it's possible to really live if you're just following along in old habits—whether they're your own or someone else's. You just travel in a groove that's so deep you can't look over the sides at what's going on above ground. I don't want to live like a mole," she ended tersely.

Mother responded instantaneously with an honesty to match her daughter's. "Is that why you've been missing so many meetings at the Lodge in the last couple of months?" she inquired.

Madge paused for a moment, absentmindedly washing the same dish over again. "I guess that comes into it," she admitted finally, and was silent.

"And do you feel better, now that you've 'asserted your independence'?" Mother gently persisted.

"That's neither here nor there, is it?" replied Madge, quietly, unable to assert a feeling of well-being in the face of her recent moodiness and flashes of temper. Intent on tracing patterns in the dish-water, she added with a sudden air of maturity, "It's never especially pleasant, breaking up an old habit."

"No," agreed Mother, thinking to herself that there were other things besides habits that could be broken. But Madge was growing up—she was almost twenty now, and old enough to make her own decisions. There were many things that Mother wanted to say to her, and yet, she thought, she's heard them all before. Suddenly Mother felt very tired, and just a trifle useless.

Madge must have felt a little of this, for she laid a soapy hand on Mother's arm. "Don't worry, Mums," she coaxed, forgetting her own mood in this new concern. "It's not anything to do with Theosophy itself, or with my interest in it. But after all, you don't have to go to every meeting of the Lodge in order to be a Theosophist! In fact, you probably make a better Theosophist if you keep moving on

your own and don't get swallowed up in one continuous round of meetings."

Mother, banishing thoughts of impotence from her mind, lifted a tolerant eyebrow at her daughter, and resolved to fight. "You don't stay out of ruts by going to some particular place, nor by not going to some other, you know," she reminded Madge. "And by the same token, you aren't in a rut just because you appear to be living in a cycle of repetition. Ruts are mental and psychic, not physical, obstacles, and they're not really changed by a new environment."

"There is no rut at all, but thinking makes it so, eh?" demanded Madge, with the air of one who *had* "heard all this before."

"Well, what do you do when you find yourself in a mental rut, then?" she added, cocking a thoughtful eye at Mother.

"Stop sliding," replied Mother, briefly, then continued, "you can't expect anything or anybody to supply you with momentum. I know you think that's the last thing you want, but actually, when you allow yourself to get into a mood—which is only another name for a rut—that's exactly what you're asking for. You want a push. But you're not going to get it from Theosophy, or from anything else. It's got to come from yourself, because you're self-moving, and there's no substitute for that."

"I guess I get restless, that's all," said Madge. "I want to go out and *do* something, not just sit there."

"No one is stopping you." Mother knew when to pamper and when to prod. "There's one thing it's sometimes well to remember," she ended, as she hung her towel on the rack and prepared to turn off the light. "If you're thinking about yourself more than about others, Theosophy—*anything*—is bound to pall on you, sooner or later. A stream with no outlet becomes stagnant—there's your rut again. You can't go anywhere with Theosophy by yourself—or *for* yourself. Theosophy doesn't mix with selfishness, and no one has ever fallen into a rut by thinking of others."

This was by way of being a new thought to Madge, and she turned it over carefully in her mind. "Well, one thing is certainly true," she said finally, "and that is, I can think of a lot of people who are in much worse ruts that I've ever been in, and Theosophy would sure help them out!"

"Go one step further, dear," said Mother with a smile, "and realize that in living by and for Theosophy, you're spreading it to where those who need it can find it!"

INAUGURAL ADDRESS

[This concluding section of Col. Olcott's November 17th address brings up the problem of psychic phenomena as related to the work of the Theosophical Movement. The closing passages concern G. H. Felt, whose discoveries on the Egyptian "Lost Canon of Proportion" (see *Isis Unveiled* I, 22) had been the subject of the meeting at which the organization of the T.S. was proposed. Olcott, in spite of Madame Blavatsky's cautioning, allowed himself to take Felt's intentions as accomplishments. H.P.B. remarked in January, 1876, that although Felt "promised to all the Theosophists to clear the atmosphere chemically and show the unseen monsters around us, and though he had done so before a dozen witnesses at least, who traduced him and called him a sorcerer, I do not know whether or when he will make his promise good." Olcott tells the sequel: "What we counted on as [the Society's] sound experimental basis, *viz.*, Felt's demonstration of the existence of the Elemental races, proved a complete and mortifying disappointment. Whatever he may have done by himself in that direction, he showed us nothing, not even the tip end of the tail of the tiniest Nature-spirit." How many "we" includes, the reader must judge for himself, but that H.P.B. was *not* included is clear, for Olcott records that "H.P.B., upon whose help everybody had—as we thought—not unreasonably counted, refused to do the slightest phenomenon at our meetings."

A review of the *Five Messages to American Theosophists,* 1888-91, is pertinent to the Inaugural Address as a whole, and will disclose how *unphilosophical* attention to phenomena was an almost continuous drag on the progress of the Society and of the Movement it temporally represented. The other chief objects of H.P.B.'s warnings are undue consideration of *methods,* instead of work, and gossip about private differences, and these weakening points are perhaps not dissociated metaphysically from the more obvious forms of psychism. At any rate, the unequivocal direction was given: "Let the Society flourish on its moral worth, and not by phenomena made so often degrading." —Eds. THEOSOPHY.]

IF I rightly apprehend our work, it is to aid in freeing the public mind of theological superstition and a tame subservience to the arrogance of science. However much or little we may do, I think it would have been hardly possible to hope for any thing if the work had been begun in any country which did not afford perfect political and religious liberty. It certainly would have been useless to attempt it except in one where all religions stand alike before the law, and where religious heterodoxy works no abridgment of civil rights.

Our society is, I may say, without precedent. From the days when the neoplatonists and the last theurgists of Alexandria were scattered by the murderous hand of Christianity, until now, the revival of a study of theosophy has not been attempted. There have been secret political, commercial, and industrial societies, and societies of freemasons and their offshoots, but, even in secrecy, they have not attempted to perform the labor which lies before us and which we will do openly.

To the protestant and catholic sectaries we have to show the pagan origin of many of their most sacred idols and most cherished dogmas; to the liberal minds in science, the profound scientific attainments of the ancient magi. Society has reached a point where *something* must be done; it is for us to indicate where that something may be found.

If we would compare our organization with its archetype, where can it be found? It can not be called theurgic, for the theurgists not only believed in God, but knew Him through their knowledge of His attributes as they exist in the ASTRAL LIGHT, or, as the old cabalists called it, the Matrix of the World. The theurgists had two kinds of mysteries—the *exoteric,* or public, and *esoteric,* or secret. The exoteric comprised the working of wonderful effects at public ceremonies,—among others the causing of statues to walk, talk, and prophesy. These effects were said to have been produced by natural forces in combination with the elementary spirits which lurk in the astral light. As the practice of even exoteric theurgy is dangerous, it was left to the High Priests and the "Initiates of the Outer Temple." But the real esoteric mysteries were chiefly confined to the hierophants. A life of the strictest purity and self-abnegation was required for it—a life such as that of Jesus or Apollonius. Certainly the Theosophical Society can not be compared to an ancient school of theurgy, for scarcely one of its members as yet suspects that the obtaining of occult knowledge requires any more sacrifices than any other branch of knowledge.

The neoplatonists formed a school of philosophy which arose in Alexandria coincidently with Christianity, and was the last public school of theurgy. It based its psychological system upon those of Pythagoras and Plato, but drew a great deal more from the primeval source of all religions, the books of Hermes and the Vedas,—of Egypt and India respectively. The Jewish Kabbalah colored neoplatonism no little, for real theurgy having degenerated at that time, and the few remaining adepts having sought solitude with the Essenes and in India, the neoplatonists had no longer access to the

real treatises upon the Divine Science (which were carefully collected and withdrawn to a secret place a few days before the burning of the Alexandrian library by Julius Cæsar), and so they had to fall back upon the Kabbalah of Moses and the Seventy. Neoplatonism was tinctured with both Orientalism and Occidentalism; and its expounders tried to present the elements of theosophy and philosophy according to the primitive doctrines of the oriental prophets, in combination with poetical Platonism and the positivism of Aristotle in the form of Grecian dialectics. Their proper doctrines were: the Oriental doctrine of Emanation; the Pythagorean Number of Harmony; Plato's ideas of the creation and the separation from the world of sense.* They believed in elementary spirits, whom they evoked and controlled—a point of especial interest to us.

We can not, of course, include ourselves among the number of American spiritualists who implicitly accept all the genuine phenomena to be produced by disembodied spirits; for while some of us unreservedly believe in the occasional return of human spirits and in the existence of true mediums, others discredit both. Moreover, of the believers, some not only admit the possibility of occult forces of nature being directed, consciously or unconsciously, by the human will for the production of startling results, but also recognize in most of the physical phenomena called spiritual the agency of elementary spirits who often falsely personate persons not communing with the circles, answer the thoughts which lie visible to them

" . . . . . as clear
As pebbles within brooks appear,"

and echo and respond to every fanciful vagary which agitates the questioner's mind.

Spiritualism proper was rife at Rome in the time of Ammianus Marcellinus, who tells us that in the days of the Emperor Valens (A.D. 371) some Greeks wishing to form a society of theurgists, were brought to trial for attempting to ascertain, through magical arts, who should succeed to the throne. They employed a small table shaped like a tripod, which was produced in court, and upon being put to the torture they confessed as follows: "We constructed this table of laurel-wood under solemn auspices. Having duly consecrated it, by pronouncing over it prayers as ordered in the treatises which we stole from a Grand Priest at Delphi, and by the use of magnetic manipulations, we succeeded in making it deliver oracles." Over the table hung suspended from the ceiling a large bronze ring,

*See Ennemoser's "History of Magic."

which swung hither and thither, and, striking the letters cut in the periphery of the table-top, gave lengthy communications. Valens hated Theodorus, a man of virtue, and as the swinging ring spelt out the letters T-h-e-o-d and stopped, the Emperor, to make sure that the object of his displeasure should not occupy the throne, had him put to death: but the murder proved a useless precaution, for *Theod*osius succeeded to the purple, and the prognostication of the table turned out correct.

There is this difference between the modern spiritualistic phenomena and the effects produced by the theurgists, that whereas no reliance can apparently be placed upon the spontaneous communications of the former without corroboration, the latter can not be untruthful, since the adepts will not permit unprogressed spirits to approach or speak.

The Mesmeric phenomena, which will of necessity invite us to careful study, were known in the most remote periods, and are described by Seneca, Martial, Plautus, and Pausanias.

We are not representatives of the school of the stoics, for "they thought the Universe to be made of matter, and to be some great animal which lives because there is nothing to interfere with it."* Moreover, Zeno's pupils taught not only that men should be free from passion and unmoved by joy or grief, but also that they should submit to the unavoidable necessity by which all things are governed; and we found this society in token of our discontent with things as they are and to endeavor to bring about something better.

Finally, we do not resemble the atomical atheists, who considered every thing a congeries of atoms, because matter can be separated into particles, and that, therefore, there could be no indivisible incorporeal being; while the very title of our society indicates that we hope to obtain knowledge of the existence of a Supreme Intelligence and of a world of spirits, by the help of physical processes.

No, we are neither of these, but simply investigators, of earnest purpose and unbiassed mind, who study all things, prove all things, and hold fast to that which is good.

Plotinus, Porphyry, Iamblichus, and the neoplatonists, all worked at theurgy separately, and at their meetings imparted to each other the results of their study and experiment. Their neophytes were obliged to follow this rule with strictness; and all were bound to protect and aid every philosopher, especially every theurgist, no matter whence he came or what school he represented.

*See Howitt's "History of the Supernatural."

The hermetists of the Middle Ages were all neoplatonists, and learned their doctrines from them. In some respects we resemble them, and yet they had dogmas to impart, which under our by-laws we have not; and, further, they were all believers in theosophy, while we are, with two or three exceptions, simply investigators, undertaking a task far more difficult than theirs, since we have no ready-made material for belief at our hand, but must create it for ourselves.

We are of our age, and yet some strides ahead of it, albeit some journals and pamphleteers more glib than truthful have already charged us with being reactionists who turn from modern light (!) to mediæval and ancient darkness! We seek, inquire, reject nothing without cause, accept nothing without proof: we are students, not teachers.

We should make ourselves familiar with the manifold powers of the human soul and test the claims for the potency of the human will. Mesmerism, spiritualism, Od, the astral light of the ancients (now called the universal ether) and its currents—all these offer us the widest and most fascinating fields of exploration. At our semi-monthly meetings, we shall have the researches and experiments of our members and of eminent correspondents in this and other countries read for our instruction, and we shall have tests, experiments, and practical demonstrations, as occasion offers. As our funds warrant, we will print and circulate our documents, and translate, reprint, and publish works by the great masters of theosophy of all times.

But until our now somewhat incongruous elements are harmonized, and a common interest results from increased familiarity with our subject, I do not anticipate that at our general meetings we shall witness such theurgic phenomena as were exhibited in the ancient temples.

It is as impossible for these results to be obtained without perfect community of thought, will, and desire, as it was for Jesus to work his wonders at Nazareth because of the prevalent unbelief, or Paul his at Athens where the populace knew how to check the subtle currents which he controlled by his will. A single very positive and unfriendly will is competent when introduced at a spiritual circle to utterly destroy the mediumistic power. If Professor Tyndall had known this law, he would not have written his nonsense to the Dialectical Society. Professor Stainton-Moses, of the University College, London, writes me that the mere entrance of such a person into the house—not even the room—has done this in his experience

frequently. Mr. Crookes says that Florence Cook, his medium, has been spoiled for a season by a walk down Regent Street; each person who brushed against her depriving her of some portion of her medianic power. If she be in fact a medium and not an impostor, I do not doubt the possibility of this being the case. Every one who has studied mesmerism is aware that no satisfactory results can be attained without perfect accord among those engaged in the experiment or standing near by as spectators. These things being so, how can we expect that *as a society* we can have any very remarkable illustrations of the control of the adept theurgist over the subtle powers of nature?

But here is where Mr. Felt's alleged discoveries will come into play. Without claiming to be a theurgist, a mesmerist, or a spiritualist, our Vice-President promises, by simple chemical appliances, to exhibit to us, as he has to others before, the races of beings which, invisible to our eyes, people the elements. Think for a moment of this astounding claim! Fancy the consequences of the practical demonstration of its truth, for which Mr. Felt is now preparing the requisite apparatus! What will the church say of a whole world of beings within her territory but without her jurisdiction? What will the academy say of this crushing proof of an unseen universe given by the most unimaginative of its sciences? What will the Positivists say, who have been prating of the impossibility of there being any entity which can not be weighed in scales, filtered through funnels, tested with litmus, or carved with a scalpel? What will the spiritualists say, when through the column of saturated vapor flit the dreadful shapes of beings whom, in their blindness, they have in a thousand cases revered and babbled to as the returning shades of their relatives and friends? Alas! poor spiritualists—editors and correspondents—who have made themselves jocund over my impudence and apostasy. Alas, sleek scientists, overswollen with the wind of popular applause! The day of reckoning is close at hand, and the name of the Theosophical Society will, if Mr. Felt's experiments result favorably, hold its place in history as that of the body which first exhibited the "Elementary Spirits" in this nineteenth century of conceit and infidelity, even if it be never mentioned for any other reason.

Yesterday and Tomorrow

The curtains of Yesterday drop down, the curtains of Tomorrow roll up; but Yesterday and Tomorrow both *are*.

—*Sartor Resartus*

PRACTICAL METAPHYSICS

III: A Realm Beyond Religion

IF we require evidence that man instinctively seeks and finds the unity of self with other selves through reliance on the metaphysical rather than the physical, we have only to turn to some of our own psychological experiences. If the desire for identification with life other than our own were of purely biological origin, "the gregarious instinct," we should find it best satisfied in congenial groups. But the deepest sort of identification sought is not personal, and reaches beyond good fellowship and personal love. There are times when, if man is *alone,* free of the personal influences which assail him in all groups, even among his own family, it is possible to experience temporarily the fullest sense of oneness and accord with life, reaching beyond partiality for particular individuals. Thoreau wrote, "However intense my experience, I am conscious of the presence and criticism of a part of me, which, as it were, is not a part of me, but a spectator, sharing no experience, but taking note of it, and that is no more I than it is you." ("Solitude," *Walden.*) Sometimes in crucial illness, when suffering drives man in upon himself, he feels closer to *all* mankind than when moving among the throngs of a great city. His contact with the oneness of life through feeling is furthered by the attainment of a temporarily detached state, the utilization of an impersonal, impartial perspective. As Schopenhauer put it: "We are all secretly aware of our share in the inexhaustible spring of eternity."

Perhaps a portion of man's very desire to stand alone, never to become completely involved in associations and sensations, has its origin in a knowledge that real identification of self with other selves must come through identification with "all-selves." The child loves his parents, but does not wish to be absorbed by that love. If the parent desires the love to be all-absorbing, it may be for the reason that he himself is no longer searching for an ultimate understanding of and identification with life. The sense of complete self-identity, when felt by a child, is not the egotistical self-sufficiency that sometimes takes its place in later years. It is simply knowledge that when he is alone he is not alone.

Every man, at some period in his life, has been mentally isolated and yet felt surges of strength within that promised the power to withstand all trials, to remain calm, serene, and inwardly protected. In moments such as these, he may feel the differences between him-

self and other men drop away, may feel accord with the fundamental nature of every living thing, and sense a duty to the whole of life. Here we touch directly the great question of human happiness. Even a modern defender of sensualism, searching inductively for the things which give us the greatest "pleasure," has written: "Underlying all our practical activity, there flows deep and strong and clear, the subterranean river of our real happiness. It is alone we deal with life, and alone we deal with the First Cause."

Here is expressed, by a "sensualist," an intuitive recognition that has also been the basis of every ascetic ideal of detachment—that men can reach a state above the senses in which the perceptive powers are better able to apprehend Reality. And the fact that the religious ascetics and mystics have obscured the path toward an impersonal, impartial plane of perception by confusing the means chosen for its attainment with the end, in no way destroys the philosophical root upon which all such practices are based.

In our search for fundamentals we have begun, inductively, to weigh the significance of basic things—the search for the One in the Many, unity in diversity, the quality of love or concern for others, and the nature of religious and mystical experience.

Let us look, from the perspective gained, upon the history of religious and scientific thought. Religious affirmations of a personal, external, materialistic God surround us, as do also implicit denials of any deity by that great mixture of fact and opinion known as "modern science." Anthropomorphic religions, by definition, are supremely personal in outlook. They attempt to describe and finally reach the source of dimly felt unity by reference to a personal being. How can such a quest succeed? If we seek unity amidst the diversity of physical things, must it not be in metaphysical, rather than physical, terms? How can the source of unity be described as a being who loves and hates, punishes and rewards? But more important, how can such a source of unity be approached in a personal way, by prayer, by genuflections, by religious observances? Religion is often too personal, too fundamentally materialistic, to bring men to a perception of a unity admittedly *meta*physical.

Science presents a strange anomaly. She seeks the unity of all things in matter, while the more she is successful in reducing matter to simpler elements, the more suspiciously matter obtains a "metaphysical" description. Science seeks a "oneness" and she venerates a method—the secret of her success—which is based upon an impersonal, impartial view. But how can impartiality originate in

matter? How can men who are nothing more than bundles of conditioned reflexes reflect anything but an ingrained prejudice no more real than anyone else's?

Our leaders in modern science have tried to achieve impersonality, made impartiality their ideal, without ever finding a basis for it in man. Because "Science" cannot admit the existence of an impersonal, therefore *metaphysical,* quality within each individual, she is unable to point rationally toward any final success for the methods she recommends. Unless man has an *inherent* impartiality or impersonality, how can he express these qualities? Only impersonal men can come to realize interdependence throughout the world and build the brotherhood of all men and nations that has been the sincere dream of many scientists, just as it has of many religious believers. To follow the typical in either religion or science in the quest for answers to the questions about which we most want to know, is to begin travelling with an unnecessary handicap. That a synthesis of the scientific and religious fields should unfold before the minds of men is clear. How else can we study the great questions, traditionally appropriated by the spokesmen of religion, with the impartiality of modern scientific method?

For those whose minds feel conscientiously impelled to proceed inductively, there is the widest of opportunities for inauguration of their own thinking, as religious dogmas crumble and science begins to become aware of its own shortcomings. The primary philosophical facts of life may be sought out by each one, weighed carefully, and arranged in the simplest, most natural patterns of meaning.

The conclusion that there is a great metaphysical oneness in all beings, that man cannot be explained except by reference to this essence of his nature, is not so difficult to reach. It may be stated by drawing together lines of evidence to point to such a conclusion, or it may simply be stated as an axiomatic point of departure, a hypothesis to be tested.

We cannot, it is true, explain man, give full purpose and meaning to life, simply by reference to this one principle, or any of its manifestations we have considered. But *without* it we cannot explain man. What meaning has man's individuality, unless we seek to understand also that which makes him strive toward an equal brotherhood of mankind? Upon this part of our nature, we build all hopes of a better world. Therefore, the essence of what all men have in common is the First Fundamental of Philosophy and Religion.

HIDDEN HINTS IN THE SECRET DOCTRINE

(From p. 184 to p. 192, Vol. I.)

By W.Q.J.

THE IMPULSE OF EVOLUTION is found in the force of the spiritual breath. It is not to be supposed because "human monads" cease to come into this chain of globes that therefore there is no impulse. The term "human monad" means that *monad which having been through all lower experiences is fitted to inform the so-far perfected human body.*

MAN FIRST IN THE 4TH ROUND. *p. 187.* The flow of human monads is at an end, except that those still incarcerated in the anthropoids have yet to come in. Full blown—or rather those that have been through all lower experiences—must proceed in their order through the strictly human evolution. The necessities of evolution demand this, and the turning point is reached in the fourth round which represents the square figure or number, and all monads in the lower kingdoms have to go on with the work of evolution in those until the next manvantara. At that time the monads now in human forms will have progressed beyond, thus leaving room for those below to come up higher.

OUR NATURES FROM WHAT. *p. 189.* In the note it is distinctly pointed out that the quotation from Shakespeare about our *natures* being marvelously mixed refers to the part which the Hierarchies of progressed souls throughout the system to which this globe belongs play in giving us our different combinations.

CORRESPONDENCE OF HUMAN EVOLUTION with the nebular evolution and condensation is to be found on these last lines of *p. 191:* "As the solid Earth began by being a ball of liquid fire, of fiery dust, and its protoplasmic phantom, so did man."

ORIGIN OF WHITE AND BLACK MAGIC. See note on *p. 192,* where it is stated that at the highest point of development of the Atlantean Race—the fourth—the separation into right and left-hand magic, or consciously good and evil thoughts, took place. Under the action of Karmic law and by the reincarnation over and over again of those engaged in these thoughts, the thoughts were preserved in the realm of mind in the double form of mental deposits and astral impressions. The mental deposits were brought back

---

NOTE.—This article was first printed in *The Path,* June, 1891.—Eds. THEOSOPHY.

again and again to earth life, and the astral impressions affected all others who came under their influence. In this way not only were seeds sown in individual minds through their own thoughts, but a vast reservoir of good and bad impressions or pictures has been created in the ethereal medium about us by which sensitive persons are impelled to good and bad acts. And all repetitions of evil thoughts have added to the stock of evil thus remaining to affect and afflict mankind. But as the good also remains, the earnest friends of mankind are able to produce good effects and impressions which in their turn are added to the sum of good. There need be no feeling of injustice on the ground that sensitive persons are affected by evil pictures in the astral light, because such possibility of being thus impressed could not have arisen except through sympathetic attractions for them set up in former lives.

"THE SO-CALLED ADVANTAGES"

If we look at the field of operation in us of the so-called advantages of opportunity, money, travel and teachers we see at once that it all has to do with the brain and nothing else. Languages, archæology, music, satiating sight with beauty, eating the finest food, wearing the best clothes, travelling to many places and thus infinitely varying impressions on ear and eye; all these begin and end in the brain and not in the soul or character. As the brain is a portion of the unstable, fleeting body the whole phantasmagoria disappears from view and use when the note of death sends its awful vibration through the physical form and drives out the inhabitant. The wonderful central master-ganglion disintegrates, and nothing at all is left but some faint aromas here and there depending on the actual love within for any one pursuit or image or sensation. Nothing left of it all but a few tendencies—*skandhas,* not of the very best. The advantages then turn out in the end to be disadvantages altogether. But imagine the same brain and body not in places of ease, struggling for a good part of life, doing their duty and not in a position to please the senses: this experience will burn in, stamp upon, carve into the character, more energy, more power and more fortitude. It is thus through the ages that great characters are made. The other mode is the mode of the humdrum average which is nothing after all, as yet, but an animal. —W.Q.J.

EVERYDAY QUESTIONS

On Patanjali's Yoga Aphorisms

Aphorisms 33, 35-45 (Book 1): What is the function of the virtues in the attainment of Soul-knowledge? A contrast between the Christian idea of the virtues and Patanjali's treatment would be helpful.

The fundamental distinction between Patanjali's "virtues" and those traditionally associated with Christianity clearly lies in the fact that for Patanjali "benevolence" and "tenderness" are *means* to the end of individual mastery over everything from the "atomic to the infinite." The Christian seems to have a historic propensity for regarding the virtues as ends in themselves, or at least, as attainments which automatically bring the reward of a completely passive existence in heaven. It is probably significant that Patanjali makes no emotional appeal whatsoever in favor of the virtues, once again unlike enthusiastic Christian hot-gospellers. The attainment of virtues in Patanjali's terms seems a rather matter-of-fact necessity, part of establishing sufficient self-control for the accomplishment of the further "ends" of evolution. Each virtue depends, Patanjali implies, upon an understanding of the laws applicable to each psychical and mental division of man's nature. A "virtue" is therefore like an ability to typewrite forty words a minute—an author can make good use of such a "virtue," but only, in the final analysis, if he has something important to say through the medium he has mastered. In the strictest sense, then, the virtues are not "accomplishments" in themselves, nor in fact guarantees of accomplishments. They represent stages of self-control *without which* accomplishments cannot be made—simply because clarity and objectivity of mind are imperative.

Aphorism 10: Is there a way for us to go to sleep by force of will? If so, there must be a way to die by force of will. Can this be the fact?

Sleep is not to be attained by the direct force of will in the case of ordinary men, although the high adept may paralyze his lower principles by an act of will—"put them to sleep," so to speak. But anyone can will to *rest,* knowing that rest is necessary, and sleep will follow the subduing of restless energies which at the moment need rehabilitation rather than strained exercise. Sleep is the force of All Life, working preservatively and regeneratively rather than creatively—not a force rooted in the individual. Death is similar in this respect, yet it would take a great Yogi indeed to know with

surety that all karmic opportunities of a lifetime had been exhausted in a manner corresponding to the instinct which often enables a man to know when sleep is justifiable. The ending of a life has a semi-finality in karmic terms which the ending of a day does not. The same personality cannot be called forth in exact duplication ever again after death, while in sleep the innumerable threads of personality remain unbroken. Therefore for one to say he is "through with life," in its present context, implies a complete knowledge of karma—a knowledge which apparently even great adepts do not claim.

Aphorism 4 states that except during concentration, "the soul is in the same form as the modification of the mind." Does this mean that to keep the soul in a pure state, it would be well not to expose the mind to the contemplation of anything unpleasant? And if so, does not this savor of the ideas of Christian Science? Might it not encourage a drawing away from contacts with the end in view of not contaminating the Soul? How can the work of aiding suffering humanity be accomplished while we are so concerned with keeping the Soul from being affected by the Mind, the brain, the senses?

It is very evidently true that the soul cannot exist in a state of full concentration if the mind is affected by something "unpleasant." But the whole meaning of the state of full concentration—which is simply the state of *balance*—lies in its definition as an awareness so acute that no-*thing seems unpleasant* (or pleasant, either, in the usual highly personal sense). The Christian Scientist denies the existence of the various real things which he is afraid he will have to view as "unpleasant" if he allows himself to view them at all. He seeks to escape the fear of "evil" by avoidance. The "Yogi of time's duration" meets *directly* all apparent evil, and conquers its potentially corrupting effect by *understanding* rather than avoidance. This is the only satisfactory "escape from evil" and it is accomplished only in the mental state called "concentration" by Patanjali. It might be said that the Sage, instead of seeing "pleasantness" or "unpleasantness," sees in all events and beings only various degrees of significance.

Aphorism 46: "The mental changes described in the foregoing constitute 'meditation with its seed'." "Meditation with its seed" is often used in the connotation of very concentrated, but personal *thinking. Is not here a very subtle form of selfishness, which is accompanied by an anticipation of consequences?*

Aphorism 44, preceding, is a definitive statement from Patanjali that in meditation with its seed "the object selected for meditation" may be "of a higher nature than sensuous objects." A practical ideal to be realized, then, as for instance a specific social improvement, may be clarified and given deeper significance by concentration during meditation. Nothing *necessary in the furtherance of growth* can be accurately regarded as selfish. Selfishness may be said to enter, in the case of those who "meditate" concentratedly upon a specific human or social need, only when the desire of the individual to be the revered and recognized agent of such improvement is added to the desire for the accomplishment itself. So, in endeavoring to establish the nature of "selfishness" and "unselfishness" as related to meditation, the line of demarcation must be seen to be *not* between "meditation with its seed" and "meditation without a seed," but rather in the nature of the "seed." For there is obviously, in Patanjali's own terms, a necessity for both types of meditation. "Meditation without a seed," or with only the subtle seed of egoic isolation and perfection, might be the *exclusive* state of none but the Dharmakayas, who apparently have finished with all desire to work for and through the world. Yet this state, the state of abstract objectivity —possibly symbolized by Pythagoras in his insistence that his disciples concentrate on mathematics—is necessary for all men: it affords impersonal balance to their "meditations" upon the specific things their destiny will impel them to accomplish. "Anticipation of consequences," for instance, is required for the most thoughtful efforts in mankind's behalf, yet to prevent that anticipation from being either fearfully or greedily personal the interposition of periods of "abstract meditation" becomes an indispensable aid.

"The Inner Darkness"

The person who revolves selfishly around himself as a center is in greater danger of delusion than any one else, for he has not the assistance that comes from being united in thought with all other sincere seekers. One may stand in a dark house where none of the objects can be distinguished and quite plainly see all that is illuminated outside; in the same way we can see from out of the blackness of our own house—our hearts—the objects now and then illuminated outside by the astral light; but we gain nothing. We must first dispel the *inner* darkness before trying to see into the darkness without; we must *know ourselves* before knowing things extraneous to ourselves. —W.Q.J.

ON THE LOOKOUT

"Disaster of Materialism"

Rockwell Kent, internationally known artist and illustrator, belongs with the growing throng of critics of modern materialism. In his attractive volume, *Voyaging,* an account of travels through the Strait of Magellan and the channel islands of Tierra del Fuego, he writes with the perspective of one thousands of miles distant from cosmopolitan centers:

> We, to whom the struggle for material comforts has become an obsession, have vauntingly named our pathway progress: our struggle may, however, be as well considered to have been a degenerate weakening, under the pressure of material discomforts, of the will toward leisure—a weakening that became a rout, a rout that we to save our pride name purpose—a purpose whose achievement in the denial of leisure we call civilization. And now at last, having become utterly and irretrievably involved in the disaster of materialism and having debauched the human soul with restlessness, we make luxury our glory, and abandon leisure to the childhood of the race.

Leisure, for Mr. Kent, means that unhurried serenity hailed by Walt Whitman: "I laze and invite my soul"—the expression of a man who has time to live with himself. This rebellion of the artist against the crass sensationalism of the modern world is nothing new. Its course, since the early decades of the century, has been variously chronicled, by Malcolm Cowley; in *After the Genteel Tradition,* and more recently by Hoffman, Allen and Ulrich in *The Little Magazine*—a useful history of esthetic protest and the attempts of modern artists to formulate a credo. Caught in the impersonal processes of the industrial, acquisitive society, the artist struggles to find a place where he can maintain his freedom and his self-respect, and at the same time, solve the personal economic problem. The frustrations of this struggle, as reported in such publications, may be regarded as an appendix to H. P. Blavatsky's article, "Civilization, the Death of Art and Beauty."

Unfortunately, few artists have within themselves the philosophical resources necessary to a real understanding of the moral decadence of their time, with the result that artistic expression is itself corrupted by the cultural environment. The current of revolt is thus channelled into blind alleys of despair, producing such movements as Dadaism, which "wanted to destroy the whole cultural structure, beginning with literature and the other arts," and today, leading to the Paris manifestoes of Existentialism, which echo the Dadaist gospel of meaninglessness, finding the highest good in "the Absurd."

Acquisitive Culture

The dilemma of the artist is created by his inwardly-felt demand for significant expression—he wants to play an effective part in the social process—while he is on all sides hemmed in by public indifference and the restrictions of a civilization almost entirely devoted to money-making. If he is to be heard, he must accept these restrictions, and this may mean a compromise of which he is morally incapable. What, for example, does modern society require of the poet in time of war? The writers of *The Little Magazine* discuss this question:

> The poet's trumpeting for a political and military cause may very well improve the quality of radio and cinema fare. But in so submitting to the demands of an issue too large and too immediate to be solved personally, he has necessarily and obviously to abandon any personal views which may run counter to it or confuse its singleness of direction. The war demands neither contemplation nor equivocation; the poet must forego both in the interests of action. . . . The pressure of events may well force him into a kind of poetic journalism, employing the obvious idiom of cultural commonplace, the kind of political comment to which the reader turns to be assured of what he already believes in. . . . Any subtlety to interpretation is a definite barrier to understanding on this level.

Political Delusions

Dissatisfaction with such limitations has again and again led to deliberate alliance between art and politics; finding political and economic conditions a barrier to their art, creative individuals throw themselves into the field of political action, hoping to assist in the birth of a society that will free the artist from the chains of prejudice and the dead weight of economic pressure. This resolve was especially noticeable in the 30's, when literary and graphic art was often indistinguishable from corresponding forms of leftwing political propaganda. Today, disillusion with artistic "politicking" has again set in, due largely to the realization that the arts are even less free in Soviet Russia than in bourgeois America. Readers of *Politics* for October are acquainted with the most recent "culture purge" in the Soviet Union, where the present emphasis is on nationalist and escapist themes in art. Thus the modern artist, lacking a fundamental viewpoint in philosophy, is returned to the dilemma which confronted him twenty years ago, and he is reduced to such outcries against materialism as Rockwell Kent provides.

"FALLEN FROM BOTH"

Eugene O'Neill, acknowledged to be the greatest living American dramatist, recently emerged from his voluntary obscurity to offer a play—"The Iceman Cometh"—in which the gloom of the artist is articulated in some four hours of despair for the human species. *Time* for Oct. 21 quoted O'Neill's personal views. Speaking of his illness—*paralysis agitans*—the playwright said that he regarded it with "enraged resignation."

> "Outwardly [said Mr. O'Neill], I might blame it on the war. . . . But inwardly . . . the war helped me realize that I was putting my faith in the old values, and they're gone. . . . It's very sad, but there are no values to live by today. . . . Anything is permissible if you know the angles.
>
> "I feel, in that sense, that America is the greatest failure in history. It was given everything, more than any other country in history, but we've squandered our soul by trying to possess something outside it, and we'll end as that game usually does, by losing our soul and the thing outside it too. But why go on—the Bible said it much better: For what shall it profit a man if he gain the whole world, and lose his own soul?"

WEB OF EFFECTS

O'Neill is struck by the "feeling around," or pervasive presence, of what he calls "fate"—"Kismet, the negative fate; not in the Greek sense." He finds, in these days, a farcical note breaking into the gloomy and tragic, "A sort of unfair *non sequitur,* as though events, as though life, were being manipulated just to confuse us." As a dramatist, Mr. O'Neill has honestly presented his time with half-truth—the half he sees. It is the truth of which H. P. Blavatsky also wrote years ago in *The Secret Doctrine,* but completed with its other half as well. Here is the "unfair *non sequitur*":

> It is the constant presence in our midst of every element of strife and opposition, and the division of races, nations, tribes, societies and individuals into Cains and Abels, wolves and lambs, that is the chief cause of the "ways of Providence." We cut these numerous windings in our destinies daily with our own hands, while we imagine that we are pursuing a track on the royal high road of respectability and duty, and then complain of those ways being so intricate and so dark. We stand bewildered before the mystery of our own making, and the riddles of life that *we will not* solve, and then accuse the great Sphinx of devouring us. . . .

And here its cause:

But verily there is not an accident in our lives, not a misshapen day, or a misfortune, that could not be traced back to our own doings in this or in another life. If one breaks the laws of Harmony, or, as a theosophical writer expresses it, "the laws of life," one must be prepared to fall into the chaos one has oneself produced. For, according to the same writer, "the only conclusion one can come to is that these laws of life are their own avengers; and consequently that every avenging Angel is only a typified representation of their re-action."

Report From Navy Medicine

Press clippings accumulated during 1946 suggest the possibility that medical science may be approaching a great reform in the field of artificial immunization. A letter to the Des Moines *Register* for May 29 of last year cites from the *Naval Medical Bulletin* (April, 1941) as follows:

On the results of test on 20,000 recruits at the Naval Training Station, San Diego, Calif., between July, 1939, and January, 1941, Capt. G. E. Thomas of the Medical Corps of the U. S. Navy says:

"The findings suggest a definite relationship between cowpox (smallpox) vaccination and the 'false' positive test (for syphilis)."

After another observation Dr. Thomas also states "It is our opinion that these findings were definitely the results of vaccinia."

Now if the health authorities want to find out where syphilis comes from why don't they investigate this phase of its origin?

Dr. Herbert Snow, surgeon of Cancer Hospital, London, part time senior surgeon says:

"I am convinced that some 80 per cent of deaths from heart disease are caused by the inoculations or vaccinations these cases have undergone. These are well known to cause grave and permanent disease to the heart."

Immunization Questioned

The Philadelphia *Evening Bulletin* for May 3, 1946, reports research at the University of California which seems to provide a solid scientific foundation for criticism of the antibody theory of artificial immunity. The report states the findings of Dr. and Mrs. Cavelti, of the Hopper Foundation for Medical Research:

. . . that the body in building up resistance to germs or other foreign invaders sometimes automatically develops substances capable of destroying tissues of its own vital organs, has been at least partially confirmed. . . .

Rats given injections of streptococcus vaccine mixed with an extract of rat kidney developed not only antibodies against a streptococcus in-

fection but also produced substances which destroyed parts of their own kidneys. This destructive process is called glomerulonephritis.

The various forms of nephritis, the medical term for degenerative kidney trouble, rank sixth among the diseases which take human life. The laboratory findings showed that the apparently innocent kidney extract rather than the supposed wicked streptococcus was responsible for the destruction. However, the presence of the strep or some other foreign substance was necessary to start the kidney substance on its rampage. . . .

CAUSE OF DEGENERATIVE DISEASES

A revolutionary phase of the research is the showing that bits of tissue detached from the kidney of an individual animal, upon passing through that same animal's blood, could produce antibodies potentially detrimental to the very organ from which fragments originated.

Medical researchers long have known that bits of tissue from an animal injected into one or another species would produce antibodies potentially destructive toward the tissues of the donor animal. But until recent years it had been taken for granted that tissues would not produce antibodies against their own kind or their own species.

Dr. Cavelti's finding that animals of the same species can produce antibodies hostile to their own tissues raised the question whether degenerative diseases such as glomerulonephritis can develop as a secondary result of the invasion of the body by a foreign substance.

It is worth noting that the rise of degenerative diseases during the past half century has run parallel to the spread of vaccination and other forms of inoculation as accepted forms of preventive medicine, both in private practice and in public health programs.

"INDEPENDENT" ART

An artistic coincidence which seems to have had some collaboration by the Astral Light was reported in the Los Angeles *Times* for Sept. 1, 1946. The *Times* art critic reproduces two water colors, one, "Evening, Cripple Creek District," done in 1937 by James H. Fitzgerald while in Colorado; the other, "Landscape," by William Gamill, soldier-artist, originally sketched in New Caledonia during the war. The two paintings, done eight years and 7,500 miles apart, with neither artist having seen the other's work, are surprisingly similar, in composition, mood and technique. Both show a sharply rising hill against ominous clouds; both hills are topped by rambling structures; both pictures show roads winding around the hills, with telegraph poles leaning over them at odd angles. There is a wagon in the foreground of each, although Fitzgerald's painting shows a team of horses, while Gamill's does not. Pictured side by side in

the *Times,* it appears as though one painting is the "reverse" of the other, an effect confirmatory of the influence of the Astral Light. "Cripple Creek District" attained some fame, and is reproduced in Norman Kent's *Water Color Illustrated.* Its familiarity caused several artists to challenge the originality of the Gamill painting, recently exhibited in Los Angeles, but this artist at once produced a number of studies of his scene, sketched on the outskirts of Noumea, New Caledonia, showing the originality of the work. A further coincidence is the fact that both artists had been students at the Los Angeles Art Center School, although at different times, and both studied under the same water color teacher. Gamill's painting won the top award at the Los Angeles show of GI art.

Religion and the Schools

Latest publication of the New York Society for Ethical Culture is a pamphlet, *Religion in Public Education,* one of a series dealing with contemporary problems under the general heading, "Ethical Frontiers." The author is Mr. V. T. Thayer, educational director of the Ethical Culture Schools in New York City, whose recent book, *American Education Under Fire,* was issued by Harper & Bros. Mr. Thayer's pamphlet presents an analysis of the tendency in the United States to establish Christianity as an "official" religion, providing a suggestive account of psychological causes behind this trend as well as stating facts. Following is a pertinent summary:

> Twenty-five or thirty years ago the secular public school seemed firmly established as a distinctively American institution. Nor was this school irreligious or "godless," as some charge today, unless it be irreligious to respect both the religious convictions and the sincere doubts of those who entrust their children to its care. Teachers had learned that it is possible to inspire a religious devotion to democratic ideals (respect for the worth and integrity of human beings, an "uncommon faith in the common man," a conviction that people realize their best selves when they dedicate their talents to the improvement of the lot of others) without the necessity of grounding these ideals arbitrarily in any one religious philosophy; but this is hardly identical with atheism!

Advancing Sectarianism

> Today the public secular school is in danger, and the principle of separation of church and state, from which it derives its being, is being undermined. As evidence, witness the following:
>
> (1) In 1913 only two states retained mandatory provision for the reading of the Bible in the public schools. Twenty years later twelve

states and the District of Columbia required its reading, in eighteen states it was optional, and in eleven only was it prohibited.

(2) In states where constitution or statute now forbids religious instruction within the schools provision is being made increasingly to provide this instruction on a released time program, sometimes within the school building, sometimes in church schools, but always with the assistance of the school authorities in the enrollment of children and the enforcement of attendance. Indeed, not infrequently the dismissal of children for religious instruction is carried on in defiance of a state law which public officials lack both the conviction and the courage to enforce. Probably in well over a thousand communities of the country today programs of religious education on released time are in operation.

USE OF FEDERAL FUNDS

(3) Nor are violations of the traditional relationship between church and state confined to matters of instruction. In recent years religious groups have made strenuous efforts to induce both state and federal governments to share the expenses of parochial education. In a number of states recent legislation sanctions the use of public funds for the transportation of children to private schools. In four states parochial schools receive free text-books at public expense. Moreover, this practice has been sustained by the Supreme Court of the United States on the theory that it is the child and not the school which benefits in these instances. This success seems to have breached the dike and private interests are pressing hungrily for the further extension of grants to parochial schools; grants for health services, for the financing of needy students, for the construction of essential buildings and the subsidizing of teachers' salaries.

SUBSIDIES SOUGHT

On the national level the friends of parochial schools have linked federal aid to non-public schools with the obvious need of financial assistance to state school systems. Few people deny the importance of lending a helping hand to education within the states. They recognize that young people from impoverished states tend to migrate to more favorable locations and that local handicaps in education affect adversely the welfare of the country as a whole. In education as in the area of health and hygiene, disease and malnutrition in one locality tend to injure another. Consequently, it behooves the people of the United States to distribute evenly the advantages of education. Knowing this full well, powerful interests in Congress are saddling all legislation directed toward equalizing educational opportunities with provisions for assistance to "non-public" as well as to public schools.

(4) Finally, the traditional alignment of Christian sects is undergoing change. The principle of separation of church and state is a Protestant, not a Catholic doctrine. It was Protestant fear of Catholics that lent support originally to the policy of barring the State treasury

against all religious groups. Catholics have always believed that while an obligation rests upon the state to finance education, the family and the church are to exercise the actual functions of education. Today an increasing number of non-Catholic as well as Catholic voices are being raised on behalf of a plan whereby taxes paid for education are to be divided between religious and public schools. In short, it is proposed that the state undertake to support parochial as well as public school education.

Return to Religion

Post-war pessimism and depression-inspired fears, Mr. Thayer suggests, have contributed to this weakening of the traditional separation of church and state in the United States. Fear, he suggests, invites authoritarian methods of social control and reduces the interest of the people in "the hard earned civil and political liberties of previous generations." The promises of the demagogue grow more attractive than the principles of the democratic heritage, fostering the spread of sinister organizations such as the Ku Klux Klan, the Black Legion, and similar groups. This writer continues:

> Under these circumstances it is not surprising to find many serious-minded people turning to religion as an anchor to the windward. Religion, as they see it, has always exercised a steadying influence in times of distress. And while not all adults profess to believe what they would have their children taught, they salve their conscience with the comforting observation that "religion never hurt anybody."

The obvious need for moral education combines with a superficial conception of "tolerance" to persuade many educators to work for religious education in the public schools. It is argued that such education need not be "sectarian," and advocates of a religious program in the schools speak of a broad, non-sectarian sort of "religion" that might be introduced without offence to any particular group. However, as Mr. Thayer points out, such proposals always involve the idea of "God," about which cluster other ideas that are certainly sectarian in implication and quite sufficient to arouse denominational rivalry.

Trend to Sectarianism

The urgency of the struggle against sectarianism in the schools is given special emphasis by the Feb. 10th decision of the United States Supreme Court to allow State tax funds to pay for the transportation of children to parochial as well as public schools. A citizen of New Jersey, Arch R. Everson, had contended that it was unconstitutional for the State to pay children's bus fares to Catholic schools, as this amounted to use of State funds to support a Church. The Court, however, approved the practice, in a five-to-four decision, the ma-

jority opinion being contributed by Justice Hugo L. Black. The 47-page dissenting opinion of Justice Rutledge was supported by Justices Frankfurter, Jackson and Burton. This decision of the Court makes similar practices in fifteen other states within the law, substantially weakening the separation of church and state in the United States. Thus, as Mr. Thayer says in the concluding portion of his pamphlet, "The American people confront today a grave decision." He continues:

DANGERS OF CHURCH INFLUENCE

> They have inherited a school that despite its failures has nevertheless contributed nobly to the creation of a united nation out of different, often antagonistic racial and religious and national groups. We are entering a future in which increasing facility of communication will accentuate rather than diminish the interplay of cultural groups. . . . In the light of these facts it is highly important that citizens undertake to preserve the integrity of the public school and to rescind practices that experience demonstrates tend only to divide young people into groups of mutual hostility and fear. Let us not limit but rather extend the principle of non-sectarian instruction to the point where respect is assured the adherents of all manner of religions and philosophies—the naturalists as well as the supernaturalists, the unchurched as well as the churched—with primary emphasis always upon principles designed to foster mutuality in living.

THE ETHICAL CULTURE MOVEMENT

Mr. Thayer's excellent pamphlet (available from the Ethical Culture Society, 2 W. 64th St., New York 23, N. Y., for 10 cents) is well conceived and developed in the spirit of the movement founded by Felix Adler in 1876, which has for its aim, "to assert the supreme importance of the ethical factor in all relations of life—personal, social, national, and international, apart from any theological or metaphysical considerations." Through the years, the Society for Ethical Culture has gained wide recognition for its practical contributions to education, and for the intelligent emphasis on moral principles which characterizes these educational undertakings. Many theosophists are familiar with Henry Neumann's *Education for Moral Growth,* a text of inestimable value for the non-sectarian educator, but may not have known of Dr. Neumann's lifelong association with the Ethical Culture Movement. David S. Muzzey, the historian, is another well-known leader of the movement. Members of this society consistently oppose the encroachments of sectarianism in public institutions, and their writings, such as the pamphlet, *Religion in Public Education,* are doing much to maintain the enlightened attitudes which are necessary to the preservation of religious freedom.

"Unforgettable Character"

Anne Morrow Lindbergh's contribution to the January *Reader's Digest* portrays an exceptional friend. Blind and totally crippled by arthritis, Edward Sheldon did not turn in upon himself in bitterness at his personal tragedy, but gave himself unstintingly to those he knew and could help by suggestion, encouragement, advice or converse. With a rare impersonality, and unusual sympathy, he entered naturally into the real concerns of another. Mrs. Lindbergh says:

> He literally never thought of himself. So complete was his self-abandonment, his absorption in the other person, that when you sat talking to him you felt that you and your family and your affairs were his only interest. For that instant it was true. He turned the full blaze of his ardent concentration and understanding upon you.

"Creative Observer"

His "swift and magical sharing" of another's mood, his ability to quickly bridge the gulf of strangeness and shyness that separates two people meeting for the first time, his capacity for establishing rapport with his fellow man—these hint at his possession of more than ordinary senses of apprehension:

> The minute you walked into his room he knew all about you, inwardly and outwardly. He saw you whole, and in his presence you felt whole. The beautiful prayer from the Phaedrus was answered: "The outward and the inward man were at one." . . . his genius was for seeing *through* the outer man to the inner one. It was his understanding of the inner man that was the most miraculous and for which one was most grateful. After all, as Saint-Exupéry's *Little Prince* says, "The eyes are blind; one can only see with the heart." Edward Sheldon saw with the heart. He saw people with love, all of them, even the newcomers like myself. He saw them, therefore, creatively; not only as they were, but as they strove to be, as they were meant to be. He became for many people the creative observer in their lives.

A creative observer, Mrs. Lindbergh goes on to describe, is one who "mirrors back your own life—yes—but your life seen in order, in form, in pattern, even—actually—in beauty." His faculty of seeing the ideal as the real was perhaps Sheldon's greatest gift to all who came. Mrs. Lindbergh remarks that "it was the rarest pleasure to bring things to him, books one had found, passages of poetry or philosophy, a 17th-century mystic or a modern poet, comments on life by a soldier one had met in a train, or by a child in a school bus. . . . With Edward Sheldon everything became more beautiful in the light of his appreciation."

"INFINITE TIME"

Confined to his bed, this man had an inner life so rich and free that an atmosphere of timelessness was almost palpable in his presence:

> One went away refreshed and stimulated, with a hundred new paths shooting off in the mind, and the quiet certainty that there was infinite time in which to follow them. The world opened up from those four closed walls. . . .
>
> "Eternity," according to Boethius, "is the complete and perfect possession of unlimited life all at once." Paradoxically, this "unlimited life all at once" is what one felt in the presence of this man who had almost no life at all in the worldly or physical meaning of the word. Seated beside him, in the heart of the world's most hurried and high-pressured city [New York], no one ever had a feeling of hurry or pressure. The sense of eternity in which he lived was passed over to the people who sat with him. There, one was able to live for a few minutes—as he lived always.

POWER OF EXAMPLE

Having known Edward Sheldon, who died last April at the age of 60, Mrs. Lindbergh feels a responsibility to let more people know about him, and is sensible of a private obligation "to remain the person one was in [his] room," to attempt "that nearly impossible task of living in the present moment as if it were eternity." Her article, an appreciation of an appreciator, may illustrate the force of ideals as well as the power of example. If man were not a continuing being, and the soul a timeless reality; if civilization were not a cooperative enterprise and brotherhood the motive-power in evolution; if the metaphysical influence of a man's life and thought were not an actual factor, his *substantial* contribution to a common humanity—then neither Mrs. Lindbergh, nor any one else, could feel a responsibility for discussing estimable human characters.

The "great man" theory of history—that a powerful individual makes history and moves events, instead of being moved to greatness by them—is a partial truth, unless by the postulates of karma and reincarnation it can be shown that *all* men create the circumstances in which their character grows or diminishes. But as long as the inherent ideas of the soul's power and responsibility have any voice at all in the heart and intuitions of the race, so long will the art of biography serve a philosophical purpose—that of demonstrating, by experience and example, the exhaustless possibilities of human evolution.